

Remarks

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner notes use of the trademark MACHANICAL DIOLE TM in the application and requires that the trademark be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Applicants have analyzed the specification and cannot find the use of the trademark MACHANICAL DIOLE TM. Applicants use the generic term “mechanical diode” in the specification; however, this term is not a trademark and thus, is not referenced as a trademark in the application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,827,644 to Stevenson et al. (hereinafter “Stevenson”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In rejecting claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 19 and 20, the Examiner called Applicants’ attention to Figure 13 and specifically element 240’ to disclose a bi-directional one-way clutch operative to brake rotation of one of said members of said planetary gear sets when the transmission is in one of reverse and forward speed. The Examiner states that the claimed recitation does not exclude the combination of low/reverse clutch 245 and a one-way clutch 240’. See Office Action dated May 15, 2006, pages 7-8.

However, amended claims 1, 12 and 20 of the present application require “a selectable braking one-way clutch for braking rotation of one of said members of said planetary gear sets when the transmission is in one of reverse and forward speed,” which now *excludes* the combination of a low/reverse clutch 245 in combination with a one-way clutch 240’ to brake rotation of one of the members of a planetary gear set when the transmission is in one of reverse and forward speeds. The selectively reversible braking one-way clutch *actually brakes* rotation of a member of a planetary gear set while the transmission is in reverse and forward speeds, thereby having fewer parts than the combination of the grounding clutch-type torque transmitting mechanism 245 with the one-way clutch 240’ of Stevenson. As a result, Applicants’ claimed invention improves transmission costs, packaging and mass.

Moreover, the Examiner states that element 245 meets the limitation of “a first rotating input clutch operatively engageable with the input shaft, wherein said first rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in first speed” and element 236 meets the limitation of “a second rotating input clutch engageable with the input shaft, wherein said second rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in reverse” because the claimed recitation does not specifically require the transfer of torque from the input shaft into the transmission. See Office Action dated May 15, 2006, page 8. Applicants disagree because “input clutch” is a known term of art that refers to a clutch which enables the transfer of input torque into a transmission or transfer case. However, Applicants have amended claims 1, 13 and 20 to recite “a first rotating input clutch operatively engageable with the input shaft for enabling the input shaft to carry torque into the transmission, wherein said first rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in first speed” and “a second rotating input clutch operatively engageable with the input shaft for enabling the input shaft to carry torque into the transmission, wherein said second rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in reverse.” Since elements 236 and 245 of Stevenson are illustrated as reaction clutches (i.e., brakes) grounded to housing 280, elements 236 and 245 cannot also be input clutches as relied upon by the Examiner. See Stevenson, Figure 13.

Furthermore, as stated previously by Applicants, claims 1, 13 and 20 require “a first rotating input clutch operatively engageable with the input shaft for transferring torque from said input shaft to said transmission, wherein said first rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in first speed” and “a second rotating input clutch engageable with the input shaft for transferring torque from said input shaft to said transmission, wherein said second rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in reverse.” However, Stevenson teaches slipping brakes 236, 245 (not input clutches) for launching into forward or reverse. Specifically, col. 8, lines 24-29 of Stevenson states that “torque transmitting mechanism 236 is used to launch in reverse ... Alternatively, torque transmitting member mechanism 236 could be used by itself as the starting clutch for both forward and reverse launch,” and col. 8, lines 55-57 generally states that grounding clutch-type torque transmitting mechanism 245 may be used for forward launch. Therefore, Stevenson does not teach “a first rotating input clutch [that]

is slipped for launching the vehicle in first speed” and “a second rotating input clutch [that] is slipped for launching the vehicle in reverse.”

Accordingly, the features of “a selectable braking one-way clutch for braking rotation of one of said members of said planetary gear sets when the transmission is in one of reverse and forward speed,” “a first rotating input clutch operatively engageable with the input shaft enabling the input shaft to carry torque into the transmission, wherein said first rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in first speed,” and “a second rotating input clutch engageable with the input shaft for enabling the input shaft to carry torque into the transmission, wherein said second rotating input clutch is slipped for launching the vehicle in reverse,” amongst other features, are not disclosed in Stevenson. For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 12 and 20 are allowable over the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11 ultimately depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-19 ultimately depend from claim 12 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

This Amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed May 15, 2006. The remarks in support of the rejected claims are believed to place this application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated with this amendment to deposit account 07-0960.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMIE ET AL.

By 
Christopher W. Quinn
Reg. No. 38,274

Date: 7-12-06

QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Suite 520
Novi, Michigan 48375
Phone: 248-380-9300
Fax: 248-380-8968

On behalf of:

Kathryn Marra, Esq.
GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION
Legal Staff Mail Code 482-C23-B21
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000